

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 2-29 are pending. Claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 2-20 have been amended to correct minor informalities and to more distinctly claim the invention. New claims 21-29 have been added. No new matter has been introduced. Applicant believes the claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indicated allowance of claims 16-20.

Claims 4-15 were objected to because of minor informalities which have been corrected. Thus, claims 4-15 are also allowable.

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka Akiba (JP 11-312470) in view of Eo et al. (USP 6,317,105). The Examiner alleges that Akiba discloses the features of claims 2 and 3 except for applying a pulse voltage to the second electrode, which is different in polarity from that of the pulse voltage applied to the first electrode. The Examiner cites Eo et al. for disclosing that the second electrode (X) is applied a pulse voltage (+Vs/2), which is in synchronism but different in polarity from that of a pulse voltage (-Vs/2) applied to the first electrode (Yi).

#1 Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 as amended is patentable over Akiba and Eo et al. because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest that in conducting the sustaining operation, onto the second display electrode is applied pulse voltage differing in polarity and amplitude thereof and nearly in synchronism with sustain pulse voltage to be applied onto the first display electrode.

The inventor in JP 11-312470 is the same inventor of the present application. As shown in Fig. 12, Akiba discloses applying the pulse voltages onto the X electrode and Y electrode, which are different in polarity and nearly in synchronism with each other, but are the same in amplitude with each other. Thus, Akiba does not disclose or suggest different amplitudes between the two pulse voltages. The specification at page 18, line 26, to page 19, line 32 discusses this feature.

Moreover, Eo et al. does not disclose pulse voltages that are in synchronism with each other. Indeed, the pulse voltages are the same in amplitude. As shown in the signal

waveforms in Fig. 3, in particular, during the "SUSTAIN DISCHARGE PERIOD," the pulse voltage applied to the electrode (X) and the pulse voltage applied to the electrode (Yi) are not in synchronism with each other, and are the same in amplitude with each other.

In addition, Akiba and Eo et al. cannot be combined in the manner suggested because they are directed to distinct apparatuses. Eo et al. discloses a plasma display apparatus having only two kinds of electrodes, namely, the X electrode and the Y electrode. Akiba discloses a plasma display having three electrodes, namely, the X electrode, the Y electrode, and the electrode for forming the partition wall.

The apparatus in Akiba and the apparatus in Eo et al. are distinct and the teachings are incompatible with one another. Accordingly, there is no motivation to combine them. Even if combined, as discussed above, Akiba and Eo et al. still fail to disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 2. Therefore, claim 2 is patentable.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 as amended is patentable over Akiba and Eo et al. because, for instance, they do not teach or suggest that in conducting the sustaining operation, onto the first display electrode is applied pulse voltage differing in polarity and amplitude thereof and nearly in synchronism with sustain pulse voltage to be applied onto the second display electrode.

As discussed above in connection with claim 2, Akiba and Eo et al. fail to disclose or suggest different amplitudes between the two pulse voltages. Moreover, there is no motivation to combine Akiba and Eo et al. since they provide incompatible teachings that are directed to distinct apparatuses. Accordingly, claim 3 is patentable.

Applicant respectfully contends that new claims 21-29 are patentable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/080,041
Amdt. dated April 26, 2004
Reply to Office Action of January 2, 2004

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Chun-Pok Leung
Reg. No. 41,405

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
RL:rl
60196539 v1